EPJ manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

On the two remaning issues in the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin

M. Wakamatsu[1]

Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, JAPAN

arXiv:1409.4474v3 [hep-ph] 21 Apr 2015

Received: date / Revised version: date

Abstract. The question whether the total angular momentum of the gluon in the nucleon can be decomposed into its spin and orbital parts without conflict with the gauge-invariance principle has been an object of long-lasting debate. Despite a remarkable progress achieved through the recent intensive researches, the following two issues still remains to be clarified more transparently. The first issue is to resolve the apparent conflict between the proposed gauge-invariant decomposition of the total gluon angular momentum and the textbook statement that the total angular momentum of the photon cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts. We show that this problem is also intimately connected with the uniqueness or non-uniqueness problem of the nucleon spin decomposition. The second practically more important issue is that, among the two physically inequivalent decompositions of the nucleon spin, i.e. the "canonical" type decomposition and the "mechanical" type decomposition, which can we say is more physical or closer to direct observation ? In the present paper, we try to answer both these questions as clearly as possible.

PACS. 11.15.-q Gauge field theories – 12.38.-t Quantum chromodynamics – 12.20.-m Quantum electrodynamics – 14.20.Dh Protons and neutrons

1 Introduction

To get a complete decomposition of nucleon spin is a fundamentally important homework of QCD [1,2]. Unfortunately, this is an extremely delicate and difficult problem, which has been rejecting a clear answer for more than 20 years since the first pioneering theoretical consideration in the paper by Jaffe and Manohar [3]. (To overview controversial status of the problem, see two recent reviews [4,5].) The central issue here is whether the total gluon angular momentum can be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts. It has long been believed that the answer is no [6,7], just because many textbooks of electrodynamics clearly state that the total photon angular momentum cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts [8,9,10,11]. On the other hand, we also know the fact that several experiments with use of paraxial laser beam confirmed that the spin and the orbital angular momentum of a photon can separately be measured [12,13]. The theoretical basis of this separation is the familiar transverse-longitudinal decomposition of the photon field. Some years ago, motivated by the idea of transverse-longitudinal decomposition of the photon field, Chen et al. proposed the idea to decompose the gluon field into the physical and pure-gauge component [14,15]. This enables them to get a gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon spin into four pieces, i.e. the spin and orbital angular momentum (OAM) parts of quarks and the spin and OAM parts of gluons. Although this is certainly a gauge-invariant decomposition of the nucleon spin, it is important to recognize that their decomposition of the gluon field is essentially the standard transverse-longitudinal decomposition, which is given only after fixing the Lorentz frame of reference. Another point is that, even within the framework of this transverse-longitudinal decomposition, the way of gauge-invariant decomposition of the nucleon spin is not unique. In fact, it was pointed out in [16] that another gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon spin exists. The difference with the original decomposition by Chen et al. is characterized by the OAM parts of quarks and gluons. The quark and gluon OAMs in the Chen decomposition is essentially the "canonical" OAMs, although gauge-invariantized. On the other hand, the quark and gluon OAMs in the decomposition proposed in [16] is the gauge-invariant "mechanical" OAMs. It is then reasonable to call these two decompositions the "canonical" and "mechanical" decompositions of the nucleon spin, respectively [4,5].

In either case, since these two decompositions are given in a fixed Lorentz frame, or given in noncovariant forms, it is not very convenient when investigating the relations with high-energy deep-inelastic-scattering (DIS) observables, which is the field of physics where the problem of

Send offprint requests to:

the nucleon spin decomposition came into existence. In the paper [17], we therefore proposed more general form of nucleon spin decomposition, which has "seemingly" covariant appearance. It was shown that, based only upon a few general conditions, one can get two different "seemingly" covariant forms of gauge-invariant complete decompositions of the nucleon spin, which was called in [17] the decomposition (I) and (II). Formally, these two provides us with the most general gauge-invariant decomposition of the nucleon spin, in the sense that any gauge-invariant decomposition falls into either of the two. In fact, the decomposition (II) was verified to contain the gauge-invariant Bashinsky-Jaffe decomposition [19] motivated by the light-cone gauge. It was also shown to contain the original Chen decomposition after an appropriate choice of the Lorentz frame. They both fall into the category of "canonical" decomposition. On the other hand, another decomposition (I) falls into the category of "mechanical" decomposition. It contains the noncovariant decomposition given in [16] after fixing the Lorentz frame, but it is more general [18].

Although most inclusive, the problem of this general framework is that the decomposition of the gluon field into the physical and pure-gauge components has large freedom or arbitrariness. In fact, it was criticized by several researchers that our formal decomposition of the gauge field into its physical and pure-gauge components is not unique at all and there can be infinitely many such decompositions, thereby being led them to the conclusion that there are in principle infinitely many decomposition of the nucleon spin [20,21,22,23,24]. This uniqueness or non-uniqueness problem of the nucleon spin decomposition is one of the two remaining issues of the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin summarized as

1. Are there infinitely many decompositions of the nucleon spin [25] ? If not, what physical principle favors one particular decomposition among many candidates ?
2. Among the two decompositions, i.e. the "canonical" type decomposition and the "mechanical" type decomposition, which can we say is more physical ? More "physical" here means that it is closer to direct measurements.

The purpose of the present paper is to answer these questions as convincingly as possible. First, in sect.2, we show that the first problem is inseparably connected with our original question, i.e. the apparent conflict between the proposed gauge-invariant decomposition of the nucleon spin, especially the gluon part, and the textbook statement that the total angular momentum of the photon cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into the spin and orbital parts. Actually, the conflict can be avoided in the following way. First, more precise statement on the decomposition of the total photon angular momentum should be the following. The total angular momentum of the photon cannot be decomposed into its spin and orbital parts so as to meet both the requirements of gauge-invariance and of the Lorentz-frame independence, simultaneously. Once the Lorentz frame is fixed, the decomposition can be made gauge-invariantly without any difficulty. This already indicates that what makes the decomposition problem of the total gluon angular momentum in the nucleon difficult is an intricate interplay between the gauge and Lorentz symmetry. In fact, we shall show that the key factor, which uniquely select one particular decomposition from many possible gauge-invariant decompositions of the nucleon spin, is the Lorentz-boost-invariance in the momentum direction of the parent nucleon.

Next, in sect.3, we discuss the second issue. It is known that the average orbital angular momentum (OAM) of quarks along the nucleon momentum defined by the Wigner distribution coincides with the gauge-invariant canonical OAM not the mechanical (or kinetic) OAM. There is also a claim that the average transverse momentum of quarks defined through the Wigner distribution coincides with the "canonical" momentum not the "mechanical" momentum. We shall show that the latter claim is not necessarily true and then give a universally correct physical interpretation of the average momentum and OAM defined by the Wigner distribution. With the help of these considerations, we also carry out a detailed comparative analysis of the canonical and mechanical OAMs, by putting special emphasis upon the relation with direct deep-inelastic-scattering (DIS) observables. Summary and conclusion are then given in sect.4.

2 The role of Lorentz symmetry in the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin

It is very important to clearly recognize that the transverse-longitudinal decomposition is given only noncovariantly, i.e. only after fixing a Lorentz-frame of reference. Seemingly covariant extension of the gauge-invariant decomposition is then proposed in the paper [17]. As expected from already known decompositions given in noncovariant forms [16], we naturally get two "seemingly" covariant decompositions of the QCD angular momentum tensor, which are physically inequivalent. (The word "seemingly" is important here, because the decomposition of the gauge field into the physical and pure-gauge component is intrinsically noncovariant even though the appearance looks covariant.) The one is the "canonical" type decomposition given as

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{QCD} = M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-spin} + M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-OAM} + M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-spin} + M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-OAM} + \text{ boost } + \text{ total divergence}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-spin} = \frac{1}{2}\,\epsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu\sigma}\,\bar{\psi}\,\gamma_\sigma\,\gamma_5\,\psi, \quad (2)$$

$$M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-OAM} = \bar{\psi}\,\gamma^\lambda\,(\,x^\mu\,i\,D^\nu_{pure} - x^\nu\,i\,D^\mu_{pure}\,)\,\psi, \quad (3)$$

$$M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-spin} = 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\{\,F^{\lambda\nu}\,A^\mu_{phys} - F^{\lambda\mu}\,A^\nu_{phys}\,\}, \quad (4)$$

$$M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-OAM} = 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\{F^{\lambda\alpha}\,(x^\mu\,\mathcal{D}^\nu_{pure} - x^\nu\,\mathcal{D}^\mu_{pure})\,A^{phys}_\alpha\}. \quad (5)$$

Here, $D^\mu_{pure} = \partial^\mu - i\,g\,A^\mu_{pure}$ is the pure-gauge covariant derivative for the fundamental representation of color SU(3), while $\mathcal{D}^\mu_{pure} = \partial - i\,g\,[A^\mu_{pure}, \cdot\,]$ is the pure-gauge covariant derivative for the adjoint representation. The other is the "mechanical" type decomposition given as

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{QCD} = M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-spin} + M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-OAM} + M^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{G-spin} + M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-OAM} + \text{ boost } + \text{ total divergence}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-spin} = M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-spin}, \quad (7)$$

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{q-OAM} = \bar\psi\,\gamma^\lambda\,(\,x^\mu\,i\,D^\nu \;-\; x^\nu\,i\,D^\mu\,)\,\psi, \quad (8)$$

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-spin} = M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-spin}, \quad (9)$$

$$M^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{g-OAM} = M'^{\lambda\mu\nu}_{G-OAM} + 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\,[\,(\,\mathcal{D}_\alpha\,F^{\alpha\lambda}\,)\,(\,x^\mu\,A^\nu_{phys} \;-\; x^\nu\,A^\mu_{phys}\,)\,], \quad (10)$$

where D^μ and $\mathcal{D}^\mu$ are the standard covariant derivative respectively acting on the fundamental and adjoint representations of color SU(3). To obtain these "seemingly" covariant decompositions, we need to impose only a few general conditions on the physical and pure-gauge components of the gluon field. They are the pure-gauge condition for the pure-gauge component of the gluon field

$$F^{\mu\nu}_{pure} \equiv \partial^\mu\,A^\nu_{pure} - \partial^\nu\,A^\mu_{pure} - i\,g\,[A^\mu_{pure}, A^\nu_{pure}] = 0, \quad (11)$$

and the homogeneous (covariant) and inhomogeneous gauge transformation properties for the physical and pure-gauge components :

$$A^\mu_{phys}(x) \to U(x)\,A^\mu_{phys}(x)\,U^{-1}(x), \quad (12)$$

$$A^\mu_{pure}(x) \to U(x)\,\left(\,A^\mu_{pure}(x) + \frac{i}{g}\,\partial^\mu\,\right)\,U^{-1}(x). \quad (13)$$

Actually, these conditions are too generic and they are not enough to fix the decomposition uniquely. Nevertheless, it was shown there that one of the above decompositions, i.e. the "canonical" type decomposition (1), contains the LC-gauge motivated Bashinsky-Jaffe decomposition [19] as well as the Chen decomposition [14,15] as special cases. The nonuniqueness of our formal decomposition is criticized by several researches [20,21,22,23,24]. This leads them to the conclusion that there are in principle infinitely many decomposition of the nucleon spin. According to Ji et al. [20,21], the arbitrariness of the decomposition comes from the path-dependence of the Wilson line, which is necessary for the decomposition of the gauge field into the physical and pure-gauge components. Another argument in favor of the existence of infinitely many decomposition of the nucleon spin was advocated by Lorce [22,23,24], based on what-he-call the Stueckelberg symmetry, which changes both of A_{phys} and A_{pure}, while leaving their sum intact. (The idea was first presented in [26]. This geometric idea is being pursued further in a recent paper [27].)

In a recent paper [28], Ji, Xu, and Zhao stepped further and showed that the total gluon helicity in a polarized proton is shown to be large momentum limit of a gauge-invariant operator $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ with $\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ being the transverse component of the gauge potential. Their argument goes as follows. First, they pointed out that, for the abelian gluon, the gluon spin operator S_G, which is deduced from the definition of the longitudinally polarized gluon distribution as its first moment, can be expressed in the following form :

$$S_G \;=\; (\boldsymbol{E}(0)\times\boldsymbol{A}_{phys}(0))^3, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{phys}(0) \;=\; \boldsymbol{A}(0) \;-\; \frac{1}{\nabla^+}\,\nabla\,A^+(\xi^-)\Big|_{\xi^-=0}. \quad (15)$$

Next, they showed that the above operator is just the IMF limit of the operator $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$. From this fact, they concluded that, to identify $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ as the gluon helicity, one must have the following conditions, that is, the IMF and physical gauge, i.e. the light-cone gauge. The statement would be nothing wrong, but it has a danger of causing a little misunderstanding. In fact, the gluon spin, or the longitudinally polarized gluon distribution, which appears in the standard formulation of the parton distribution functions (PDFs), has an important property that it does not depend on the magnitude of the nucleon momentum. Since this boost-invariance of general collinear parton distributions (PDFs) along the direction of the nucleon momentum plays a decisive role in our subsequent argument, we think it useful to convince this property following Collins' textbook [29]. Let us start with the well-known definition of the simplest unpolarized PDF of the nucleon given as

$$\int\,\frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,k\cdot n}\;\langle P\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\;\not{n}\,\psi(\lambda\,n)\,|\,P\rangle, \quad (16)$$

with n being the standard light-like vector, while P is the momentum of the nucleon. Since the r.h.s. is a scalar function, it must be a function of $k\cdot n$ and $P\cdot n$ as

$$\tilde q\,(k\cdot n,\,P\cdot n). \quad (17)$$

The expression (16) is obviously invariant under the scaling of the 4-vector n by an arbitrary positive factor, which means that only the combination $x \equiv k\cdot n\,/\,P\cdot n$ is allowed. This gives the standard definition of the unpolarized PDF given as

$$q(x) \;=\; \int\,\frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x\,(P\cdot n)}\;\langle P\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\;\not{n}\,\psi(\lambda\,n)\,|\,P\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Now let us consider the Lorentz boost with a velocity v along the direction of the nucleon momentum P, which we can take the 3-direction without loss of generality. It is given by

$$x^0 \;\to\; \gamma\,(x^0 \;-\; v\,x^3), \quad x^1 \;\to\; x^1, \quad x^2 \;\to\; x^2, \quad x^3 \;\to\; \gamma\,(x^3 \;-\; v\,x^0), \quad (19)$$

with $\gamma = 1\,/\,\sqrt{1-v^2}$. Under this boost, $k\cdot n$ and $P\cdot n$ transform as

$$k\cdot n \;\to\; \gamma\,(1-v)\,k\cdot n, \quad P\cdot n \;\to\; \gamma\,(1-v)\,P\cdot n, \quad (20)$$

so that the ratio $x = (k\cdot n)\,/\,(P\cdot n)$ is obviously invariant under it. Naturally, this also applies to the longitudinally polarized gluon distributions and also the gluon spin, which is defined as the first moment of the former.

To see the importance of the constraint of Lorentz-frame independence in our problem of the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin, it is instructive to compare a noticeable difference between various definitions of the physical component of the gauge field [30]. Namely, we compare the LC gauge motivated definition, the temporal-gauge motivated one, the spatial axial-gauge motivated one, and the Coulomb-gauge motivated one given as

$$A^k_{phys} \;=\; \frac{1}{D^+}\,F^{+k}, \tag{21}$$

$$A^k_{phys} \;=\; \frac{1}{D^0}\,F^{0k}, \tag{22}$$

$$A^k_{phys} \;=\; \frac{1}{D^3}\,F^{3k}, \tag{23}$$

with $k = 1,$ or 2, and $D^+ \equiv \partial^+ - i\,g\,A^+$, $D^0 \equiv \partial^0 - i\,g\,A^0$, $D^3 \equiv \partial^3 - i\,g\,A^3$, while

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{phys} \;=\; \boldsymbol{A} \;-\; \nabla\,\frac{1}{\nabla^2}\,\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{A}. \tag{24}$$

In principle, all these definitions of the physical component of the gluon give the corresponding definitions of the gluon spin by the relation,

$$\Delta G = \frac{1}{2\,P\cdot\tilde{n}}\,\langle PS\,|\,2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j\tilde{n}}(0)\,A^k_{phys}(0)\right]\,|\,PS\rangle. \tag{25}$$

Here, $\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}$ $(j,k = 1,2)$ is the antisymmetric tensor in the transverse plane with $\epsilon^{12}_{\perp} = +1$. On the other hand, $F^{i\tilde{n}} \equiv F^{i\lambda}\,\tilde{n}_{\lambda}$, where $\tilde{n}^{\mu} = (1,0,0,-1)/\sqrt{2}$ for the choice (21), $\tilde{n}^{\mu} = (0,0,0,1)$ for the choice (23), and $\tilde{n}^{\mu} = (1,0,0,0)$ for the choices (22) and (24). Note however that a prominent feature of the LC gauge motivated choice of the physical component is that it is invariant under the Lorentz-boost along the 3-direction, i.e. the direction of nucleon momentum, which we have seen is a necessary condition for the definition of the gluon spin corresponding to the DIS measurements. In fact, under the Lorentz boost along the 3-direction given by (19), we can easily verify that the physical component in the LC-gauge motivated definition is just invariant :

$$\begin{aligned} A^k_{phys} \;\equiv\; \frac{1}{D^+}\,F^{+k} \;&=\; \frac{1}{\partial^+ - i\,g\,A^+}\,F^{+k} \\ &\to\; \frac{1}{\gamma\,(1-v)\,(\partial^+ - i\,g\,A^+)}\,\gamma\,(1-v)\,F^{+k} \\ &=\; \frac{1}{D^+}\,F^{+k} \;=\; A^k_{phys}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

On the contrary, any other definitions of A^k_{phys} is not invariant under the boost. For example, the physical component with the temporal-gauge-motivated choice transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} A^k_{phys} \equiv \frac{1}{D^0}\,F^{0k} \;&=\; \frac{1}{\partial^0 - i\,g\,A^0}\,F^{0k} \\ &\to\; \frac{1}{\gamma\,[\,(\partial^0 - v\,\partial^3) \;-\; i\,g\,(A^0 - v\,A^3)\,]}\;\gamma\,(F^{0k} - v\,F^{3k}) \\ &=\; \frac{1}{D^0 - v\,D^3}\;(F^{0k} - v\,F^{3k}), \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

so that it is not clearly boost-invariant. We therefore conclude that what plays a key role in the uniqueness problem of the gauge-invariant decomposition of the nucleon spin is the Lorentz-frame independence, or more precisely the Lorentz-boost invariance along the direction of parent nucleon. This means that, somewhat unexpectedly, the relativity plays more crucial role than the gauge principle in the unique definition of measurable longitudinal gluon spin and consequently in the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the longitudinal nucleon spin.

Still nontrivial observation is as follows. In the free field limit, we can always set both of the scalar and longitudinal components to be zero :

$$A^0 \;=\; A^3 \;=\; 0. \tag{28}$$

In this case, all of the general axial-gauge motivated definitions of the physical component of the gluon reduce to the same expression :

$$\texttt{LC} \;:\; A^k_{phys} = \frac{1}{D^+}\,F^{+k} \;\to\; \frac{1}{\partial^+}\,\partial^+\,A^k = A^k, \tag{29}$$

$$\texttt{temporal} \;:\; A^k_{phys} = \frac{1}{D^0}\,F^{0k} \;\to\; \frac{1}{\partial^0}\,\partial^0\,A^k \;= A^k, \tag{30}$$

$$\texttt{axial} \;:\; A^k_{phys} = \frac{1}{D^3}\,F^{3k} \;\to\; \frac{1}{\partial^3}\,\partial^3\,A^k \;= A^k. \tag{31}$$

This indicates perturbative equivalence of these three. In fact, the 1-loop anomalous dimension of the gluon spin operators was calculated in [25] and it turned out that they are all equal :

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j+}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle_G\,|_{A^+=0} \\ &=\; \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_S}{4\,\pi}\cdot\frac{\beta_0}{\varepsilon}\right]\,\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j+}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle^{tree}_G, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j0}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle_G\,|_{A^0=0} \\ &=\; \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_S}{4\,\pi}\cdot\frac{\beta_0}{\varepsilon}\right]\,\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j0}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle^{tree}_G, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j3}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle_G\,|_{A^3=0} \\ &=\; \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_S}{4\,\pi}\cdot\frac{\beta_0}{\varepsilon}\right]\,\langle PS\,|\,\epsilon^{jk}_{\perp}\,F^{j3}\,A^k_{phys}\,|\,PS\rangle^{tree}_G, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $\beta_0 = 11 - 2\,n_f\,/\,3$. (We recall that, for the LC-gauge and temporal-gauge motivated choices, not only the divergent part but also the finite one in the 1-loop corrections to the gluon spin operator were calculated in [30] and shown to coincide including the finite part. However, the spatial axial-gauge motivated choice was not investigated by them, because they thought that this choice does not have a straightforward gluon spin interpretation. We shall later show that this case also has helicity interpretation.)

The analysis above also reveals the following fact. In the free field case, since we can eventually set $A^0 = A^3 =$

0, the physical components of the gluon field is obviously the two transverse components A^1 and A^2. Under the presence of the quark-gluon interaction or the color-charged sources for the gluons, the situation is more complicated. It is true even in this case that the independent dynamical degrees of freedom, which should be quantized, are the two transverse degrees of freedom, and the other two components, i.e. the scalar component A^0 and the longitudinal component A^3 are the dependent fields, which can be expressed in terms of other dynamical degrees of freedom, i.e. the two transverse components of the gluon field and the quark field. (In the covariant treatment of gauge theories, the scalar and longitudinal components are also quantized. In this case, however, we must work in the Hilbert space with indefinite metric.) Nonetheless, because of the constraint of the Gauss law, we cannot set both of A^0 and A^3 to be zero simultaneously. (One might say that they still contain nontrivial physics at least in our problem of a strongly-coupled bound system of quarks and gluons.) This is thought to be the reason why the above mentioned various definitions of the physical component of the gluon lead to physically different definitions of the gluon spin in a nonperturbative sense.

We emphasize that, if the definition of the gluon spin operator corresponding to DIS observations is uniquely fixed, it also means that there is only one (or two) nucleon spin decomposition. The explicit form of the gluon spin operator can naturally be read out from the standard expression of the longitudinally polarized gluon distribution $\Delta g(x)$ given by Manohar [31] :

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta g(x) &= \frac{i}{4\,\pi\,x\,P^+}\int d\xi^-\, e^{i\,x\,P^+\,\xi^-} \\ &\quad\times \langle PS\,|\,\tilde{F}_a^{+\lambda}(0)\,\mathcal{L}_{ab}[0,\xi_-]\,F^+_{b,\lambda}(\xi^-)\,|\,PS\rangle \\ &= \frac{i}{4\,\pi\,x\,P^+}\int d\xi^-\, e^{i\,x\,P^+\,\xi^-} \\ &\times \langle PS\,|\,2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\tilde{F}^{+\lambda}(0)\,\mathcal{L}[0,\xi_-]\,F^+{}_\lambda(\xi^-)\,\mathcal{L}[\xi^-,0]\right]|\,PS\rangle, \quad (35)\end{aligned}$$

where a, b are color indices. If we assume the usual principle-value prescription to handle the singularity in the distribution functions with use of the relation [32],

$$\int dx\ P\,\frac{1}{x}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\ =\ i\,\pi\,\epsilon(\lambda), \quad (36)$$

where $\epsilon(x)$ is a step function defined as $\epsilon(x) = +1$ for $x > 0$ and $\epsilon(x) = -1$ for $x < 0$, the first moment of $\Delta g(x)$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta G\ &=\ \int dx\,\Delta g(x) \\ &=\ \frac{1}{2\,P^+}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)\int d\xi^-\ \epsilon(\xi^-) \\ &\times\langle PS\,|\,2\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{F}^{+\lambda}(0)\,\mathcal{L}[0,\xi^-]\,F^+{}_\lambda(\xi^-)\,\mathcal{L}[\xi^-,0]\Big]|\,PS\rangle. \quad (37)\end{aligned}$$

This can also be expressed as

$$\Delta G = \frac{1}{2\,P^+}\,\langle PS\,|\,2\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\left[\epsilon_\perp^{jk}\,F^{j+}(0)\,A^k_{phys}(0)\right]|\,PS\rangle, \quad (38)$$

with the definition of the physical component of the gluon field [33] :

$$\begin{aligned}A^k_{phys}(0) = -\,\frac{1}{2}\int d\xi^-\,\epsilon(\xi^-) \\ \times\ \mathcal{L}[0,\xi^-]\,F^{+k}(\xi^-)\,\mathcal{L}[\xi^-,0]. \quad (39)\end{aligned}$$

Hatta showed [33] that the above-defined physical component and the pure-gauge component given by $A^k_{pure} \equiv A^k - A^k_{phys}$ legitimately satisfy the general conditions (11), (12) and (13). We also point out that the above definition of the physical component is formally equivalent to (21). Anyhow, the above expression is gauge-invariant as well as Lorentz-boost invariant along the 3-direction. This especially means that we can work in arbitrary gauges, although A^k_{phys} can be reduced to a local form only in the light-cone gauge.

What remains to be answered is the original question about apparent contradiction with the standard textbook statement, which tells us that the total angular momentum of the photon cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts. A key to resolve this dilemma is the existence of particular direction in the DIS physics, which is nothing but the direction of nucleon momentum. (The importance of a preferred direction dictated by the experimental conditions for the gauge-invariant decomposition has also been pointed out in footnote of [19] and page 14 of [22], although the similarity with the photon spin measurement was not mentioned in these papers.) To understand it, we just recall that we have already encountered a similar situation in the decomposition problem of the total photon angular momentum. In the clearly written papers [34,35], Van Enk and Nienhuis argued that the total angular momentum of free electromagnetic field can certainly be decomposed into spin and orbital parts without causing conflict with gauge-invariance. This separation is based on the familiar transverse-longitudinal decomposition of the photon field. They clearly recognized that this separation is not Lorentz invariant. The Lorentz-invariance is not essential in this problem, however. The reason is that the measurement of the spin and OAM of the photon is carried out by making use of the interaction between atoms and the paraxial laser beam of a photon and that this measurement is performed in a fixed laboratory frame. One now realizes that a common feature of the gluon spin measurement and the photon spin measurement is the existence of a particular spatial direction. This particular direction in the photon spin and OAM measurement is nothing but the direction of paraxial laser beam, whereas it is the direction of nucleon momentum in the case of gluon spin measurements. We think that the final remark of the paper by Van Enk and Nienhuis is extremely enlightening to understand the physics behind and we quote it here for pedagogical reason. "The conclusion is that both "spin" and "orbital" angular momentum of a photon are well defined and separately measurable. This concerns all three components. However, only the components along the propagation direction can be measured by detecting the change in internal and external angular momentum of an atom, respec-

tively." Also interesting to point out here is the following fact. In more general nonparaxial case, it was argued that there is no clear separation of the total photon angular momentum into its spin and OAM parts [36]. Although the separation is not still impossible, a peculiarity is that both the spin and OAM parts is generally dependent of the photon helicity [37]. This appears to be consistent with the complexity of the transverse spin decomposition of the nucleon spin [20,38,39,40] as compared with the longitudinal decomposition : the latter is of our main concern in the present paper.

Now we are ready to make a clear summary statement on the apparent contradiction between the two observations pointed out in Introduction. On the one hand, we know the classical statement in the standard textbooks of electrodynamics that the total angular momentum of a massless particle cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts. As already pointed out in Introduction, this statement should be replaced by more precise one as follows. The total angular momentum of a massless particle cannot be decomposed into its spin and orbital parts so as to meet both requirements of gauge-invariance and the Lorentz-frame independence. On the other hand, we know that the spin and OAM of a photon can be separately measured. We conclude that what rescues this conflict is the existence of a particular spatial direction. Although the idea of *transversality* is certainly Lorentz-frame-dependent in general, the (gauge-invariant) transverse component of the photon or (gauge-covariant) physical components of the gluon can consistently be defined with respect to this particular spatial direction. Still, one should not forget about an important difference between the measurement of the photon spin and that of the gluon spin in the nucleon : that is the role of relativity. Different from the photon spin problem, the relativity plays an essential role in the decomposition problem of the total gluon angular momentum. What uniquely fix the nucleon spin decomposition corresponding to DIS measurements is the requirement of boost-invariance along the direction of the nucleon momentum. After all, the fact is that the Lorentz symmetry plays more crucial role than the gauge symmetry in the proper definition of the nucleon spin decomposition.

Although we believe that the argument above essentially demystifies the controversial points in the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin, we think it instructive to inspect the physical contents of the resultant gluon spin operator in some more detail. In the LC gauge, the theoretical expression of the gluon spin reduces to the following form :

$$\Delta G = \frac{1}{2\,P^+}\,\langle PS\,|\,(\boldsymbol{E}_\perp \times \boldsymbol{A}_\perp)^3 \,+\, \boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp\,|\,PS\rangle, \quad (40)$$

where we have omitted the color indices, for brevity. In the above equation, $\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ should be understood to represent the physical component in the light-cone gauge. We emphasize that the presence of the 2nd term is very important, because the 1st term alone is not invariant under the boost along the 3-direction. This can easily be verified from the following transformation properties of the relevant quantities under the boost along the 3-direction.

$$E^1 \,\to\, \gamma\,(E^1 \,-\, v\,B^2), \quad E^2 \,\to\, \gamma\,(B^2 \,+\, v\,B^1), \quad (41)$$

$$B^1 \,\to\, \gamma\,(B^1 \,+\, v\,E^2), \quad B^2 \,\to\, \gamma\,(B^2 \,-\, v\,E^1), \quad (42)$$

and

$$A^{1,2} \,\to\, A^{1,2}. \quad (43)$$

We stress again that the boost-invariance of the physical or transverse component $\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ is guaranteed only for the light-cone gauge or light-cone gauge motivated choice. Jaffe once tried to estimate the contributions of both terms of (40) in the bag model as well as in the quark model [41]. Jaffe already recognized the fact that, since the sum is boost-invariant, the above ΔG can in principle be calculated in any Lorentz-frame including the rest frame of the nucleon, provided that the above $\boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ is the gauge potential in the LC gauge.

What is curious here is the physical meaning of the unfamiliar 2nd term of (40). Interestingly, it resembles the following quantity :

$$S \,=\, \int \boldsymbol{B}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}\; d^3x, \quad (44)$$

except the absence of the 3-component in $\boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp$. In the field of space and laboratory plasma physics [42], the above S is called the magnetic helicity, and it is known to be a topological invariant of magnetic field configuration. This might indicates that, if a topological configuration of the gluon field play some role in the gluon spin, it is through this 2nd term.

Aside from such a speculation, a perturbative consideration manifests transparent physical meaning of the term $\boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp$. Using the familiar free field expansion of the gauge potential,

$$\boldsymbol{A}_\perp(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \int d^3\tilde{k} \sum_{\lambda=\pm\,1} \times\,[\,a(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,e^{-\,i\,k\cdot x} + a^\dagger(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^*(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,e^{\,i\,k\cdot x}\,], \quad (45)$$

with $d^3\tilde{k} \,=\, d^3k\,/\,(2\,\pi)^3\,|\boldsymbol{k}|$, and with λ representing the two helicity states of the gluon, one can easily verify the following two relations :

$$\int \boldsymbol{E}_\perp \times \boldsymbol{A}_\perp\, d^3x = \int d^3\tilde{k} \sum_{\lambda=\pm\,1} \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\;\lambda\, a^\dagger(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,a(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda), \quad (46)$$

and

$$\int \boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp\, d^3x = \int d^3\tilde{k} \sum_{\lambda=\pm\,1} \lambda\, a^\dagger(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,a(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda). \quad (47)$$

Then, despite its unfamiliar appearance, the term $\boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp$ also has the meaning of gluon helicity at least in a perturbative sense. Adding up the two terms, we thus find the following equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\int \left[\,(\boldsymbol{E}_\perp \times \boldsymbol{A}_\perp)^3 \,+\, \boldsymbol{B}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_\perp\,\right] d^3x = \sum_{\lambda=\pm\,1} \lambda\; a^\dagger(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda)\,a^(\boldsymbol{k},\lambda). \quad (48)$$

As a consequence, we find that the sum of the two pieces in (40) reduces to the ordinary helicity operator of the gluon.

3 Physical interpretation of the average transverse momentum and longitudinal orbital angular momentum of quarks in the nucleon defined by the Wigner distribution

The purpose of the present section to discuss the superiority or inferiority of the canonical and mechanical decompositions of the nucleon spin from the viewpoint of observation. Let us start with the definition of the average transverse momentum and average longitudinal orbital angular momentum (OAM) of quarks in the nucleon defined through the Wigner distribution as

$$\langle k_\perp^i \rangle^{\mathcal{L}} = \int dx \int d^2b_\perp \int d^2k_\perp \; k_\perp^i \, \rho^{\mathcal{L}}(x, \boldsymbol{b}_\perp, \boldsymbol{k}_\perp), \quad (49)$$

$$\langle L^3 \rangle^{\mathcal{L}} = \int dx \int d^2b_\perp \int d^2k_\perp \times (\boldsymbol{b}_\perp \times \boldsymbol{k}_\perp)^3 \, \rho^{\mathcal{L}}(x, \boldsymbol{b}_\perp, \boldsymbol{k}_\perp), \quad (50)$$

where $i = 1,$ or 2. Here, the Wigner distribution is a 5-dimensional phase-space distribution defined by

$$\rho^{\mathcal{L}}(x, \boldsymbol{b}_\perp, \boldsymbol{k}_\perp) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp}{(2\,\pi)^2} \int \frac{d^2\boldsymbol{\xi}_\perp \, d\xi^-}{(2\,\pi)^3} \times e^{\,-\,i\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{b}_\perp} \, e^{\,i\,(x\,P^+\,\xi^-\,-\,\boldsymbol{k}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_\perp)} \times \langle p', s' \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^+ \, \mathcal{L}[0, \xi] \, \psi(\xi) \,|\, p, s \rangle, \quad (51)$$

with $P = \frac{1}{2}(p' + p)$ and $p' - p = (0, \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp, 0)$. The Wigner distribution is generally dependent on the path of the gage-link $\mathcal{L}[0, \xi]$ connecting the two space-time points 0 and ξ. The two physically interesting choices of the gauge-link paths are the future-pointing light-like staple path $\mathcal{L}^{+LC}$ and the past-pointing light-like staple path $\mathcal{L}^{-LC}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{L}^{\pm LC}[0, \xi] \equiv \mathcal{L}^{(st)}[0^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp, \pm\infty^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp] \times \mathcal{L}^{(st)}[\pm\infty^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp, \pm\infty^-\,\boldsymbol{\xi}_\perp] \, \mathcal{L}^{(st)}[\pm\infty^-\,\boldsymbol{\xi}_\perp, \xi^-\,\boldsymbol{\xi}_\perp]. \quad (52)$$

Here, $\mathcal{L}^{(st)}[\xi, \eta]$ represent a straight-line path connecting directly the two space-time points ξ and η. (In the following, the suffix (st) will be omitted for brevity, when there is no possibility of misunderstanding.) The two choices respectively corresponds to the kinematics of semi-inclusive hadron productions and that of Drell-Yan processes.

For the average transverse momentum and average longitudinal OAM of quarks respectively defined by (49) and (50), Burkardt derived the following relations [43]. First, for the average transverse momentum, he showed that

$$\langle k_\perp^i \rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; \langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{mech} \;+\; \langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{int}^{\pm LC}. \quad (53)$$

where

$$\langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{mech} \;=\; \frac{1}{2\,p^+} \, \langle p, s \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0) \, \frac{1}{i} \, D_\perp^i(0) \, \psi(0) \,|\, p, s \rangle. \quad (54)$$

with $D_\perp^i \equiv \partial_\perp^i - i\,g\,A_\perp^i$, while

$$\langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{int}^{\pm LC} = -\,\frac{1}{2\,p^+} \int_0^{\pm\infty} d\eta^- \, \langle p, s \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0) \, \mathcal{L}[0^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp, \eta^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp] \times g\,F^{+i}(\eta^-, \mathbf{0}_\perp) \, \mathcal{L}[\eta^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp, 0^-\,\mathbf{0}_\perp] \, \psi(0) \,|\, p, s \rangle. \quad (55)$$

Similarly, for the average longitudinal OAM, he obtains

$$\langle L^3 \rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; \langle L^3 \rangle_{mech} \;+\; \langle L^3 \rangle_{int}^{\pm LC}, \quad (56)$$

where

$$\langle L^3 \rangle_{mech} = \mathcal{N} \int d^2r_\perp \, \epsilon_\perp^{ij} \, r_\perp^i \times \langle p, s \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \, \gamma^+ \, \frac{1}{i} \, D_\perp^j(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \, \psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \,|\, p, s \rangle, \quad (57)$$

with $\mathcal{N} = 1 \,/\, (2\,p^+ \int d^2r_\perp)$, and

$$\langle L^3 \rangle_{int}^{\pm LC} \;=\; -\mathcal{N} \int d^2r_\perp \int_0^{\pm\infty} d\eta^- \, \epsilon_\perp^{ij} \, r_\perp^i \times \langle p, s \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \, \gamma^+ \, \mathcal{L}[0^-\,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp, \eta^-\,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp] \times g\,F^{+j}[\eta^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp] \, \mathcal{L}[\eta^-\,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp, 0^-\,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp] \, \psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \,|\, p, s \rangle. \quad (58)$$

Burkardt gave the following physical interpretation to these equations. For example, for the choice $\mathcal{L} = +LC$ corresponding to the semi-inclusive DIS, he pays attention to the difference between $\langle k_\perp^i \rangle^{+LC}$ and $\langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{mech}$, i.e. the 2nd term $\langle k_\perp^i \rangle_{int}^{+LC}$ of (53). According to him, this quantity can be interpreted as the change of transverse momentum of the quark when it leaves the target after being struck by the virtual photon in the semi-inclusive reactions. The legitimacy of this interpretation can easily be convinced by taking the light-cone gauge. In this gauge, the gauge-link along the light-cone direction becoms unity and the relevant component of the field-strength tensor reduces to

$$-\,\sqrt{2}\,g\,F^{+2} = -g\,F^{02} \;-\; g\,F^{32} = g\,(E^2 \;-\; B^1) \;=\; g\,[\boldsymbol{E} \;+\; (\boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{B})]^2, \quad (59)$$

which is nothing but the y-component of the color Lorentz force acting on a particle that moves with the light velocity in the $-\,z$ direction.

Entirely analogously, the difference between $\langle L^3 \rangle^{+LC}$ and $\langle L^3 \rangle_{mech}$ can be interpreted as the change of OAM of the struck quark by the torque of the color Lorentz force.

This is certainly a very natural physical interpretation. Also interesting here is the relation with Hatta's finding [44]. Hatta showed that, because of the time-reversal and parity (PT) symmetry, the average OAMs corresponding to the two paths $\mathcal{L} = \pm LC$ are exactly the same and that it coincides with the gauge-invariant (GI) canonical OAM, i.e.

$$\langle L^3 \rangle^{+LC} \;=\; \langle L^3 \rangle^{-LC} \;=\; \langle L^3 \rangle_{can}, \quad (60)$$

where

$$\langle L^3 \rangle_{can} = \mathcal{N} \int d^2r_\perp \, \epsilon_\perp^{ij} \, r_\perp^i \, \langle p, s \,|\, \bar{\psi}(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \, \gamma^+ \times \frac{1}{i} \, D_{\perp, pure}^j(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \, \psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \,|\, p, s \rangle. \quad (61)$$

with the definition of the pure-gauge covariant derivative, $D^i_{\perp,pure}(\boldsymbol{r}_\perp) = \nabla_{r^i_\perp} - i\,g\,A^i_{pure}(\boldsymbol{r}_\perp)$. Here, A^μ_{pure} is the pure-gauge component of the decomposition $A^\mu = A^\mu_{phys} + A^\mu_{pure}$. This means that the average longitudinal OAM defined through the Wigner distribution coincide with the GI OAM not the mechanical one and that it is process-independent. One might expect that a similar relation hold also for the average transverse momentum,

$$\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{\pm LC} \stackrel{?}{=} \langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{can}, \tag{62}$$

where the GI canonical transverse momentum is defined as

$$\langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{can} = \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\frac{1}{i}\,D^i_{\perp,pure}(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle, \tag{63}$$

In fact, Lorce claims in [23] that the momentum variable in the Wigner distribution refers to the canonical momentum not the mechanical momentum. In the following, we show that this statement is not always true and then give a universally correct physical interpretation of the average transverse momentum as well as the average longitudinal OAM defined through the Wigner distribution.

To this end, we first recall the following fact. According to Hatta [44], there are plural possibilities to define the physical component of the gluon in the decomposition $A^\mu = A^\mu_{phys} + A^\mu_{pure}$. They are

$$A^i_{phys}(0) \equiv -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\eta^-\ (\pm\,\theta(\pm\,\eta^-)) \times \mathcal{L}[0^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp,\eta^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp]\,g\,F^{+i}(\eta^-,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp)\,\mathcal{L}[\eta^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp,0^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp], \tag{64}$$

or

$$A^i_{phys}(0) \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\eta^-\ \epsilon(\eta^-) \times \mathcal{L}[0^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp,\eta^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp]\,g\,F^{+i}(\eta^-,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp)\,\mathcal{L}[\eta^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp,0^-\,\boldsymbol{0}_\perp], \tag{65}$$

Here, $\theta(x)$ is the ordinary step function of Heaviside, while the sign function $\epsilon(x)$ is defined as 1 for $x>0$ and -1 for $x<0$. As shown by Hatta [44], in the case of average longitudinal OAM, any of the above choices for A^i_{phys} gives the same answer for $\langle L^3\rangle^{\pm LC}$, which coincides with the canonical OAM of quarks. This is due to the PT-even nature of the quantity $\langle L^3\rangle$. As one can convince easily, it is not necessarily true for the average transverse momentum. If one adopts the first choice (64), one certainly obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{\pm LC} &= \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\frac{1}{i}\,D^i_\perp(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,g\,A^i_{phys}(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\frac{1}{i}\,D^i_{\perp,pure}(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\ &\equiv \langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{can},\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

which in fact coincides with the definition of the GI canonical transverse momentum in conformity with the conclusion of Lorce [23]. On the other hand, however, it is a well known fact that the average transverse momentum corresponding to the future-pointing staple light-cone path and the past-pointing stale light-cone path have different signs as [45,46,47]

$$\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{-LC} = -\,\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{+LC}. \tag{67}$$

Then, the canonical transverse momentum defined as above is not a universal quantity, i.e. it is process-dependent. (Here the word "path-dependence" and "process-dependence" should not be taken too generically. What is meant here is actually the dependence on the direction of the staple-like gauge link, which respectively correspond to two physical processes, i.e. the semi-inclusive hadron productions and the Drell-Yan processes.)

More natural choice of A^i_{phys} is therefore given by (65). In this case, by using the mathematical identity

$$\pm\,\theta(\pm\,\eta^-) = \frac{1}{2}\,[\,\epsilon(\eta^-)\ \pm\ 1], \tag{68}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{\pm LC} &= \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\frac{1}{i}\,D^i_\perp(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,g\,A^i_{phys}(0)\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\ &\mp \frac{1}{4\,p^+}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\eta^-\,\langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\mathcal{L}[0^-,\eta^-] \\ &\qquad\times g\,F^{+i}(\eta^-)\,\mathcal{L}[\eta^-,0^-]\,\psi(0)\,|\,p,s\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where A^i_{phys} corresponds to the choice (65). The 1st and the 2nd terms are respectively the mechanical transverse momentum $\langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{mech}$ and the potential momentum $\langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{pot}$. Combining these terms, the physical component contained in $D^i_\perp$ cancels with the 2nd term so that the sum reduces to the definition of the canonical transverse momentum $\langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{can}$. Obviously, for this 2nd choice of A^i_{phys}, the definition of the canonical momentum is path-independent or process-independent. However, we now have

$$\langle k^i_\perp\rangle^{\pm LC} \neq \langle k^i_\perp\rangle_{can}. \tag{70}$$

The argument above proves non-universal nature of the statement in [23] that the momentum variable in the Wigner distribution refers to the canonical momentum not the mechanical momentum. In our opinion, the above-mentioned arbitrariness in the definition of the canonical transverse momentum is an indication of mathematical or theoretical (rather than physical) nature of the canonical transverse momentum in contrast to mechanical transverse momentum with more physical meaning. (Note that there is no ambiguity in the definition of the latter. As we have repeatedly emphasized [16,17,18,5], physical nature of the mechanical momentum as compared with the canonical momentum is reflected in the fact that the former not the latter appears in the equation of motion with Lorentz force.)

Interestingly, if we adopt the 2nd option (65) for A^i_{phys}, not only the mechanical transverse momentum but also

the canonical transverse momentum vanish due to the PT symmetry,

$$\langle k^i_\perp \rangle_{mech} \;=\; \langle k^i_\perp \rangle_{can} \;=\; 0. \tag{71}$$

This means that only the last term of (69) contributes to the average transverse momentum $\langle k^i_\perp \rangle^{\pm LC}$. As is well-known, this 3rd term can be related to the gluon-pole term of the twist-3 quark gluon correlation function $\Psi_F(x,x')$ known as the Efremov-Teryaev-Qiu-Sterman (ETQS) function [48,49,50], which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \frac{d\xi^-}{2\,\pi} \int \frac{d\eta^-}{2\,\pi}\, e^{\,i\,p^+\,\xi^-\,x}\, e^{\,i\,p^+\,\eta^-\,(x'-x)} \\
&\times \langle p,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0)\,\gamma^+\,\mathcal{L}[0^-,\eta^-]\,g\,F^{+i}(\eta^-)\,\mathcal{L}[\eta^-,\xi^-]\,\psi(\xi)\,|\,p,s\rangle \\
&=\; \frac{1}{p^+}\,\epsilon^{ij}_\perp\, s^j_\perp\;\Psi_F(x',x) \;+\; \cdots .
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

In fact, it is an easy exercise to show that

$$\langle k^i_\perp \rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\epsilon^{ij}_\perp\, s^j_\perp\;(\mp\,\pi)\;\int dx\,\Psi_F(x,x). \tag{73}$$

On the other hand, the average transverse momentum defined by the Wigner distribution can also be expressed with the transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) distribution. By starting with the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle k^i_\perp \rangle^{\pm LC} &= \int dx \int d^2b_\perp \int d^2k_\perp\; k^i_\perp\;\rho^{\gamma^+}(x,\boldsymbol{b}_\perp,\boldsymbol{k}_\perp) \\
&= \int dx \int k^2_\perp\;\tilde\rho^{\gamma^+}(x,\boldsymbol{k}_\perp,\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp)|_{\Delta_\perp=0},
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

together with the widely-used parametrization of the generalized TMD (GTMD) [51],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde\rho^{\gamma^+}(x,\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp,\boldsymbol{k}_\perp) \\
&=\; \frac{1}{2\,p^+}\left[\gamma^+\,F_{11} + \frac{i\,\sigma^{i+}\,\Delta^i_\perp}{2\,M_N}\,(2\,F_{13}-F_{11})\right. \\
&+\; \left.\frac{i\,\sigma^{i+}\,k^i_\perp}{2\,M_N}\;2\,F_{12} \;+\; \frac{i\,\sigma^{ij}\,k^i_\perp\,\Delta^j_\perp}{M_N^2}\,F_{14}\right]\,u(p,s),
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

one can show that

$$\langle k^i_\perp \rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; -\,\frac{1}{2}\;\epsilon^{ij}_\perp\, s^j_\perp\;\int dx \int d^2k_\perp\;\frac{\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp}{M_N}\,f^\perp_{1T}(x,\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp). \tag{76}$$

Here, $f^\perp_{1T}$ is the familiar Sivers function [52,53], related to the imaginary part of the GTMD F_{12} as

$$f^\perp_{1T}(x,\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp) \;=\; \mathrm{Im}\,F_{12}\,(x,\xi=0,\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp,\boldsymbol{k}_\perp\cdot\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp=0,\boldsymbol{\Delta}^2=0). \tag{77}$$

Comparing (73) and (76), we therefore reproduce the well-known relation between the Sivers function and the ETQS function given as [47]

$$\int d^2k_\perp\;\frac{\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp}{M_N}\,f^\perp_{1T}(x,\boldsymbol{k}^2_\perp) \;=\; \mp\,\pi\;\Psi_F(x,x). \tag{78}$$

In the above analysis, we have shown that the identification of the average transverse momentum of quarks defined through the Wigner distribution with the canonical momentum is not necessarily justified and that the definition of the canonical transverse momentum has intrinsic ambiguity. What is a universally correct physical interpretation of the Wigner-distribution-based average transverse momentum, then ? The answer can easily be read out from the paper by Burkardt [43]. Taking the semi-inclusive DIS case as a concrete example, one is allowed to say that the average transverse momentum of quarks defined by the Wigner distribution represents the asymptotic momentum of a quark after it leaves the target. Note that this interpretation holds independently of the definitions of the canonical transverse momentum. Naturally, how to relate this asymptotic momentum of quarks to observables is a highly nontrivial question, because of the color confinement of QCD, which does not allow the existence of free quarks. Nevertheless, to grasp the physical meaning of the average transverse momentum defined by the Wigner distribution, it may be instructive to imagine a very hard quark jet produced in the above-mentioned semi-inclusive DIS. The produced parent quark is supposed to be fragmented into several hadrons running fast. If one can measure the transverse momenta of all these hadrons, one can in principle reconstruct the transverse momentum of the original quark. Needless to say, the fact is not so simple, because the fragmentation process occurs through the interaction with the residual spectator. The detail may not be unrelated to the definition of the quark jet algorithm. Nonetheless, we believe that the above gedankenexperiment clarifies the physical interpretation of the average transverse momentum defined through the Wigner distribution. Remember that this quark transverse momentum in the asymptotic region is related to the Sivers function on the one hand, and the gluon-pole term of the ETQS function on the other hand.

Next, we shall discuss the interpretation of the average longitudinal OAM defined through the Wigner distribution, by paying attention to the similarity and the difference with the case of average transverse momentum. We first point out that, using the technique as described in [54], the final- or initial-state interaction term given by (58) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle L^3 \rangle^{\pm LC}_{int} \;=\; &-\mathcal{N}\,d^2r_\perp\;\epsilon^{ij}_\perp\;\left(-\,i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\Delta^i_\perp}\right)\int_0^{\pm\infty} d\eta^- \\
&\times \langle p,\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2,s\,|\,\bar\psi(0^-,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\,\gamma^+ \\
&\times \mathcal{L}[0^-\boldsymbol{r}_\perp,\eta^-\boldsymbol{r}_\perp]\,g\,F^{+j}(\eta^-,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\,\mathcal{L}[\eta^-\boldsymbol{r}_\perp,0^-\boldsymbol{r}_\perp] \\
&\times \psi(0^-,\boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\,|\,p^+,-\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2,s\rangle|_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp=0}.
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

With use of the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{\pm\infty} d^-\eta\,f(\eta^-) \;=\; \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\eta^-\;\left(\pm\,\theta(\pm\,\eta^-)\right)\;f(\eta^-) \\
&=\; \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\eta^-\;\left(-\,\frac{1}{2\,\pi}\right)\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx'\,\frac{i}{x'-x\mp i\,\varepsilon} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times\, e^{\,i\,p^+\,\eta^-\,(x'-x)}\,f(\eta^-),
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

it can further be transformed into

$$\langle L^3\rangle^{\pm LC} = \mathcal{N}\, p^+ \int d^2 r_\perp\, \epsilon_\perp^{ij} \left(-\, i\, \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta_\perp^i}\right) \int \frac{d\xi^-\, d\eta^-}{(2\,\pi)^2}$$
$$\times \int dx \int dx'\, \frac{i}{x' - x \mp i\,\varepsilon}\, e^{\,i\,x\,p^+\,\xi^-}\; e^{\,i\,p^+\,\eta^-\,(x'-x)}$$
$$\times \langle p^+, \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2, s' \,|\, \bar\psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\, \gamma^+\, \mathcal{L}[0^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp, \eta^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp]$$
$$\times g\, F^{+j}(\eta^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\; \mathcal{L}[\eta^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp, 0^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp]$$
$$\times \psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \,|\, p^+, -\,\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2, s\rangle|_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp = 0}. \qquad (81)$$

As shown by Hatta and Yoshida [55], the quark-gluon correlation function appearing in the above equation can be parametrized as

$$(p^+)^2 \int \frac{d\xi^-}{2\,\pi} \int \frac{d\eta^-}{2\,\pi}\; e^{\,i\,p^+\,\xi^-\,x}\; e^{\,i\,p^+\,\eta^-\,(x'-x)}$$
$$\times \langle p^+, \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2,\, s' \,|\, \bar\psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\, \gamma^+$$
$$\times \mathcal{L}[0^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp, \eta^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp]\, g\, F^{+j}(\eta^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp)\, \mathcal{L}[\eta^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp, 0^-\, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp]$$
$$\times \psi(0^-, \boldsymbol{r}_\perp) \,|\, p^+, -\,\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp/2, s\rangle$$
$$= \epsilon_\perp^{ij}\, p^+\, \bar s_\perp^j\, \Psi_F(x, x') + \epsilon_\perp^{ij}\, \bar s^+\, \Delta_\perp^j\, \Phi_F(x, x') + \cdots, \qquad (82)$$

with $\bar s^\mu = (s'^\mu + s^\mu)/\,2$. (Our normalization of the nucleon spin vector is that $s^2 = -\,1$.) Here, $\Psi_F(x, x')$ is the familiar ETQS function, whereas $\Phi_F(x, x')$ is a totally new quark-gluon correlation function that does not appear in the forward limit $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp \to 0$. They have the following symmetry properties

$$\Psi_F(x, x') \;=\; \Psi_F(x', x), \;\; \Phi_F(x, x') \;=\; -\,\Phi_F(x', x). \qquad (83)$$

Inserting the above parametrization (84) into (81), the $\Psi_F(x, x')$ term drops out and one obtains

$$\langle L^3\rangle_{int}^{\pm LC} \;=\; s^+ \int dx \int dx'\; \frac{1}{x' - x \mp i\varepsilon}\, \Phi_F(x, x'). \qquad (84)$$

Next, because of the antisymmetric property (83) of the function $\Phi_F(x, x')$, the gluon-pole term does not contribute to the above integral, and only the principle part remains, thereby leading to

$$\langle L^3\rangle_{int}^{\pm LC} = s^+ \int dx \int dx'\; \mathcal{P}\, \frac{1}{x' - x}\, \Phi_F(x, x')$$
$$= \langle L^3\rangle_{pot}. \qquad (85)$$

This last formula is just the expression of the potential angular momentum $\langle L^3\rangle_{pot}$ given by Hatta [44] except for the overall sign difference from our definition. (The reason of our definition is explained in our review paper [5].) We therefore reconfirms that

$$\langle L^3\rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; \langle L^3\rangle_{mech} \;+\; \langle L^3\rangle_{pot} \;=\; \langle L^3\rangle_{can}, \qquad (86)$$

which shows that the average longitudinal OAM of quarks defined through the Wigner distribution reduces to the GI canonical OAM. Undoubtedly, the process-independence of this canonical OAM is a consequence of vanishing gluon-pole contribution, which is totally different from the average transverse momentum case. Alternatively, it can be traced back to the PT even nature of the longitudinal OAM. What is interesting to remember here is the universal nature of our interpretation of the physical quantities defined through the Wigner distribution, which holds commonly for the average transverse momentum and longitudinal OAM. We already gave an interpretation that the average transverse momentum defined by the Wigner distribution gives the momentum of the quark in the asymptotic region after leaving the spectator in the semi-inclusive DIS processes. Note that exactly the same interpretation holds also for the average longitudinal OAM. Namely, we can interpret that the average longitudinal OAM defined by the Wigner distribution represents the OAM of the quark in the asymptotic region after leaving the spectator. If it were not for the color confinement, this quark would be free. This naturally explains the reason why the canonical OAM (basically free field OAM) not the mechanical OAM appears in the Wigner-function-motivated definition. As we shall discuss shortly, however, this does not mean that the canonical OAM is easier to measure within the standard theoretical framework of DIS scatterings.

At this stage, it is useful to recall the fact that, as first pointed out by Lorce and Pasquini [56], the average OAM defined by the Wigner distribution can also be expressed with the GTMD F_{14} appearing in the parametrization (75). The relation is given by

$$\langle L^3\rangle^{\pm LC} \;=\; \langle L^3\rangle_{can}$$
$$= \; s^+ \Big\{ -\int dx \int d^2 k_\perp\; \frac{\boldsymbol{k}_\perp^2}{M_N^2}$$
$$\times\, F_{14}(x, \xi = 0, \boldsymbol{k}_\perp^2, \boldsymbol{k}_\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp = 0,\, \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp^2 = 0) \Big\}. \qquad (87)$$

Since this should coincides with the sum of $\langle L^3\rangle_{mech}$ and $\langle L^3\rangle_{pot}$ and since we know that the mechanical OAM $\langle L^3\rangle_{mech}$ can be related to the known GPD $G_2(x, \xi, t)$ as [57,58,54, 55]

$$\langle L^3\rangle_{mech} \;=\; s^+ \left\{ -\int dx\, x\, G_2(x, \xi = 0, \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp^2 = 0) \right\}, \qquad (88)$$

we conclude that the following relation must hold

$$-\int dx \int d^2 k_\perp\, \frac{\boldsymbol{k}_\perp^2}{M_N^2}\, F_{14}(x, 0, 0, 0, 0)$$
$$= \; -\int dx\; x\, G_2(x, 0, 0)$$
$$+ \int dx \int dx'\, \mathcal{P}\; \frac{1}{x' - x}\, \Phi_F(x, x'). \qquad (89)$$

This corresponds to the relation (78) between the Sivers function and the ETQS function obtained from the analysis of the average transverse momentum of quarks. We emphasize the fact that the quark-gluon correlation function appearing in the above equation has nothing to do with the familiar ETQS function. This in turn implies non-quantitative nature of the frequently-claimed connection between the Sivers function and the quark orbital angular

momentum. From the practical viewpoint, the above relation (89) may not be a very useful relation. To see it, we shall first concentrate on the l.h.s. of the above relation. The problem is that, as first emphasized by Courtoy et al., the GTMD F_{14} drops out in both the TMD and GPD formulation [59,60]. The TMD factorization and/or the collinear factorization are the bases of model-independent extraction of TMDs, PDFs, and GPDs. Then, if it does not appear in either factorization, there is no way to extract it in a model-independent way. We recall that the situation is very similar to the D-state probability of the deuteron. It is generally believed that the OAMs of a constituent in a composite system is not a direct observable. This is easily convinced by considering the decomposition of the total spin of the deuteron, which is the simplest nucleus aside from the proton itself. Using the standard-form wave function of the deuteron given as

$$\psi_d(\boldsymbol{r}) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\,\pi}}\left[\,u(r) \;+\; \frac{S_{12}(\hat{\boldsymbol{r}})}{\sqrt{8}}\;w(r)\right]\chi_{S=1}, \qquad (90)$$

where $u(r)$ and $w(r)$ are the radial wave functions of the S- and D-states, while $\chi_{S=1}$ is the spin state of the deuteron, the total angular momentum of the deuteron can be decomposed into the orbital and intrinsic spin parts as

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \;&=\; \langle J^3\rangle = \langle(\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}\times\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})^3\rangle \;+\; \langle\hat{S}^3\rangle \\ &=\quad \frac{3}{2}\,P_D \;+\; \left(\,P_S \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\,P_D\,\right), \end{aligned} \qquad (91)$$

where P_S and P_D are the S- and D-state probabilities defined by

$$P_S \;=\; \int_0^\infty [u(r)]^2\,r^2\,dr, \quad P_D \;=\; \int_0^\infty [w(r)]^2\,r^2\,dr. \qquad (92)$$

One sees that the OAM contribution to the deuteron spin is 3/2 times the D-state probability. However, it is a well-known fact that the D-state probability of the deuteron is not a direct observable [61,62]. The point is that bound-state wave functions, especially its short range part, are not direct observables. In fact, it was explicitly demonstrated in [63] that the D-state probability of the deuteron can drastically be altered by varying the short-distance part of the nuclear force and consequently the nuclear wave function without affecting the direct observables like the deuteron binding energy or the asymptotic D/S ratio, etc. To be more general, the nuclear wave functions of any nucleus and consequently the momentum distribution of the nucleon in the nucleus are not direct observables. The situation is very different for the momentum distributions of partons in the nucleon. Owing to the factorization theorem, the momentum distributions of partons in the nucleon are believed to be model-independently extracted, so that they are thought to be observables or at least quasi-observables.

Coming back to the F_{14} sum rule, the GTMD F_{14} appears in neither of the TMD factorization scheme nor the collinear (GPD) factorization scheme, so that there is no way to extract it model-independently. Needless to say, although the GTMD F_{14} would not correspond to a direct observable, it does not mean that it is useless. From the theoretical viewpoint, F_{14} can be calculated in some models or within the framework of lattice QCD, so that it does give an useful insight into the spin contents of the nucleon. The situation is again very similar to the D-state probability of the deuteron, which gives valuable information on the spin structure of the deuteron, even though it is a theoretical-scheme dependent quantity.

Let us next turn to the discussion on the r.h.s. of the relation (41). To clearly understand its significance from the observational viewpoint, we think it instructive to recall the key factor in the derivation of the important relation (88), which was first discovered by Polyakov et al. [57,58] and later reconfirmed by several authors [54,55]. The starting point is the identity

$$0 \;=\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^i\,\not{n}\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,\not{D}(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle, \qquad (93)$$

with $\langle\cdots\rangle = \langle p',s'\,|\,\cdots\,|\,p,s\rangle$, which holds exactly owing to the QCD equation of motion $\not{D}(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda) = 0$ [64,65]. Using the so-called Chisholm identity

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^\mu\,\gamma^\nu\,\gamma^\lambda \;&=\; g^{\mu\nu}\,\gamma^\lambda \;+\; g^{\nu\lambda}\,\gamma^\mu \\ &-\; g^{\mu\lambda}\,\gamma^\nu \;+\; i\,\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}\,\gamma_\rho\,\gamma_5, \end{aligned} \qquad (94)$$

one thus obtains

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&=\; i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\,\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^i\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle \\ &-\; \langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^+\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,D^i(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle \\ &+\; i\,\epsilon^{i+\beta\rho}\,\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma_\rho\,\gamma_5\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,D_\beta(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle. \end{aligned} \qquad (95)$$

Next, we take the Fourier transform over the variable λ. Based on the parametrization of the twist-2 and twist-3 GPDs [57,58,55],

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\,\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^i\,\mathcal{L}(0,\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle \\ &=\;\bar{u}(p',s')\,\left[\,\frac{\Delta_\perp^i}{2\,M_N}\;G_1^q \;+\; \gamma^i\,(\,H^q+E^q+G_2^q\,)\right. \\ &\left.+\;\frac{\Delta_\perp^i\,\gamma^+}{P^+}\;G_3^q \;+\; \frac{i\,\epsilon_T^{ij}\,\Delta_\perp^j\,\gamma^+\,\gamma_5}{P^+}\;G_4^q\right]u(p,s), \end{aligned} \qquad (96)$$

together with the identity

$$\bar{u}(p',s')\,\gamma^i\,u(p,s) \;=\; -\,\epsilon_\perp^{ij}\,\Delta_\perp^j\,s^+, \qquad (97)$$

the 1st term on the r.h.s. of (95) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\,i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\,\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^i\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle = -\,i\,\epsilon_\perp^{ij}\,\Delta_\perp^j\,s^+ \\ &\times\,x\,[\,H^q(x,0,0)+E^q(x,0,0)+G_2^q(x,0,0)\,]+\cdots. \end{aligned} \qquad (98)$$

On the other hand, the 3rd term gives

$$\begin{aligned} &i\,\epsilon^{i+\beta\rho}\int\frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\,e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\;\langle\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma_\rho\,\gamma_5\,\mathcal{L}[0,\lambda]\,D_\beta(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\,\rangle \\ &=\; i\,\epsilon_\perp^{ij}\,\Delta_\perp^j\,s^+\,\Delta q(x) \;+\;\cdots, \end{aligned} \qquad (99)$$

where $\Delta q(x)$ is the familiar longitudinally polarized PDF of quarks. Particularly important for our discussion here is the 2nd term. One can show that [54,55]

$$\int \frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\, e^{\,i\,\lambda x}\ \langle \bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^{+}\,D^{i}(\lambda)\,\psi(\lambda)\rangle = \ i\,\epsilon_{\perp}^{ij}\,\Delta_{\perp}^{j}\,s^{+}\int dx'\,\Phi_{D}(x,x'). \tag{100}$$

Here, $\Phi_D(x,x')$ is the D-type quark-gluon correlation function defined by

$$\int \frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\int \frac{d\mu}{2\,\pi}\ e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\,e^{\,\mu\,(x'-x)} \times \langle p',s'\,|\,\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^{+}\,\mathcal{L}[0,\mu]\,D^{i}(\mu)\,\mathcal{L}[\mu,\lambda]\,\psi(\lambda)\,|\,p,s\rangle = \ \epsilon^{+i\rho\sigma}\,\bar{s}_{\rho}\,\Delta_{\perp,\sigma}\,\Phi_{D}(x,x')\ +\ \cdots. \tag{101}$$

Collecting these three terms, and integrating over x, we are thus led to the relation

$$2\,J^{q}\ +\ \int x\,G_{2}^{q}(x,0,0)\,dx\ -\ L^{q}\ -\ \Delta q\ =\ 0. \tag{102}$$

Here, use has been made of the familiar Ji relation,

$$\int x\,[\,H^{q}(x,0,0)\ +\ E^{q}(x,0,0)\,]\,dx\ =\ 2\,J^{q}, \tag{103}$$

together with the obvious relation,

$$\int dx\int dx'\ \Phi_{D}(x,x')\ =\ L^{q}. \tag{104}$$

Since $2\,J^{q}=2\,L^{q}+\Delta q$, it then follows that

$$L^{q}\ =\ -\int x\,G_{2}^{q}(x,0,0)\,dx \tag{105}$$

It is very important to recognize the fact that the quark OAM appearing in the above manipulation is the manifestly gauge-invariant mechanical OAM not the canonical OAM. This is perfectly consistent with our general statement before that what appears in the equation of motion is the mechanical OAM not the canonical OAM.

Although the quark OAM appearing in the above discussion is the mechanical OAM, it is not impossible to divide it into the canonical OAM and the potential OAM, as was done in the analysis of Hatta and Yoshida [55]. This uses the relation between the D-type and F-type quark-gluon correlation functions elaborated in the work by Eguchi, Koike, and Tanaka [66]. Using their technique, it can be shown that the F-type quark-gluon correlation function $\Phi_F(x,x')$ defined by the equation,

$$\int \frac{d\lambda}{2\,\pi}\int \frac{d\mu}{2\,\pi}\ e^{\,i\,\lambda\,x}\,e^{\,i\,\mu\,(x'-x)} \times\ \langle p',s'\,|\,\bar{\psi}(0)\,\gamma^{+}\,\mathcal{L}[0,\mu]\,g\,F^{+i}(\mu)\,\mathcal{L}[\mu,\lambda]\,\psi(\lambda)\,|\,p,s\rangle = P^{+}\,\epsilon_{\perp}^{ij}\,s_{\perp}^{j}\,\Psi_{F}(x,x')+\epsilon_{\perp}^{ij}\,\Delta_{\perp}^{j}\,s^{+}\,\Phi_{F}(x,x')+\cdots, \tag{106}$$

has the symmetry

$$\Phi_{F}(x,x')\ =\ -\,\Phi_{F}(x',x), \tag{107}$$

and that it is not independent of the D-type quark-gluon correlation function $\Phi_D(x,x')$, which we know is related to the mechanical OAM. In fact, Hatta and Yoshida showed that the following relation holds [55]

$$\Phi_{D}(x,x')\ =\ \mathcal{P}\,\frac{1}{x-x'}\,\Phi_{F}(x,x')\ +\ \delta(x-x')\,L_{can}^{q}(x). \tag{108}$$

Here, $L_{can}^{q}(x)$ is the canonical OAM distribution of quarks, whose integral over x gives the net canonical OAM. We are interested here only in the net OAM, because the local distribution can easily be altered by the surface terms usually neglected in the nucleon spin decomposition problem. (The full function of surface terms in the nucleon spin decomposition problem still remains to be clarified [67,68].) From the above relation, we thus obtain

$$L_{can}^{q}\ =\ L_{mech}^{q}\ +\ L_{pot}^{q}, \tag{109}$$

with

$$L_{mech}^{q}=\int dx\int dx'\ \Phi_{D}(x,x'), \tag{110}$$

$$L_{pot}^{q}=\int dx\int dx'\ \mathcal{P}\,\frac{1}{x'-x}\,\Phi_{F}(x,x'). \tag{111}$$

As pointed out before, the mechanical OAM L_{mech}^{q} can be related to an observable, i.e. the GPD G_2^q. On the other hand, in order to know L_{can}^{q} or L_{pot}^{q}, we need to know the full information of the F-type quark-gluon correlation function, or at least its principle-part integral. It is not clear whether the extraction of it can be done in a theoretical-scheme-independently way or not.

In a recent paper [69], Lorce carried out an exhaustive analysis of the matrix elements of various forms of energy-momentum tensors as well as the related angular momentum tensors, aiming at clarifying the relation between several forms of nucleon spin decomposition. He concluded that two-parton TMD distributions cannot provide any qualitative model-independent information about the parton OAM. This statement is consistent with our conclusion that the GTMD F_{14} does not appear in any established factorization schemes. Among several relations derived in his paper, particularly relevant to our discussion is the relation showing the difference between the canonical OAM and mechanical (or kinetic) OAMs of quarks and gluons :

$$\langle L^{q}\rangle_{can}\ -\ \langle L^{q}\rangle_{mech}=-\,[\,\langle L^{G}\rangle_{can}\ -\ \langle L^{G}\rangle_{mech}\,] = \ s^{+}\,A_{4}^{e,3}(0,0). \tag{112}$$

Here, $A_4^{e,3}(\xi,t)$ is the time-even part of energy-momentum form factor defined by the following Lorentz structure of the nucleon matrix element of the tensor $T_3^{\mu\nu}$:

$$\langle p',s'\,|\,T_{3}^{\mu\nu}(0)\,|,\,p,s\rangle = \ \bar{u}(p',s')\,\frac{P^{\mu}\,i\,\sigma^{\nu\rho}\,\Delta_{\rho}}{2\,M_{N}}\,A_{4}^{e,3}(\xi,t)\,u(p,s), \tag{113}$$

where

$$T_{3}^{\mu\nu}(x)\ =\ -\,\bar{\psi}(x)\,\gamma^{\mu}\,g\,A_{phys}^{\nu}(x)\,\psi(x). \tag{114}$$

Undoubtedly, aside from overall sign difference, $A_4^{e,3}(0,0)$ just corresponds to the potential angular momentum, which is related to the twist-3 quark-gluon correlation function $\Phi_F(x,x')$ as

$$A^{e,3}(0,0) \;=\; -\int dx \int dx'\; \mathcal{P}\,\frac{1}{x'-x}\;\Phi_F(x,x'). \quad (115)$$

This energy-momentum form factor, corresponding to the tensor operator containing only the physical component of the gluon field, does not appear in the cross-section formula of the standard GPD factorization scheme. Again, this would throw some doubt on the direct observability of the canonical OAM. It should be contrasted to the fact that the GPD G_2, the 2nd moment of which gives the mechanical quark OAM, appears in the GPD factorization formula, so that it can in principle be thought of as an observable. Naturally, to extract the twist-3 GPD G_2 would not be a practically easy task. However, we recall the fact that, although indirectly, the mechanical quark OAM can be accessed already at the twist-2 level through the relation [6] :

$$L^q_{mech} = \frac{1}{2}\int x\;[H^q(x,0,0)+E^q(x,0,0)]\;dx \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\,\Delta q. \quad (116)$$

In principle, a similar analysis is possible also for the gluon mechanical OAM [17], although the extraction of the gluon GPDs is extremely hard even at the twist-2 level.

4 Summary and Conclusion

We have investigated the problem of the gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon spin. The central question here is whether the total gluon angular momentum can be decomposed into its spin and orbital parts without conflicting the gauge-invariance principle. Although many recent investigations show that the answer is certainly affirmative, no clear answer has ever been given as to the question whether it does not contradict the standard textbook statement that the total angular momentum of a massless particle like the photon or the gluon cannot be gauge-invariantly decomposed into its spin and orbital parts. We have shown that what enables to circumvent the conflict is the existence of a particular spatial direction in the physics that we are dealing with. It is the direction of the nucleon momentum in the parton physics, which plays the same role as the direction of paraxial laser beam in the physics of photon spin and OAM measurements. The physical or transverse components of the gluon or the photon, which are respectively gauge-covariant and gauge-invariant, can consistently be defined with respect to these axises, even though the concept of *transversality* is in general Lorentz-frame dependent.

The uniqueness or nonuniqueness problem of the gluon spin or the gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon spin can also be easily resolved once we notice the existence of this particular direction in the parton physics. We have shown that the physical requrement of the Lorentz-boost invariance along the direction of the parent nucleon momentum selects one favorable decomposition of the gluon spin from many possible candidates. It is the definition based on the light-cone gauge motivated choice of the physical component of the gluon. This means that, in some sense, the Lorentz symmetry plays more vital role than the gauge symmetry in the unambiguous definition of the gluon spin, which can be probed by the DIS measurements.

We have also discussed another practically more important problem of the nucleon spin decomposition, i.e. the relation with direct observables. Of particular interest to us is to unravel relative merits of the canonical-type decomposition and the mechanical-type one from the observational viewpoint. Now that both decomposition satisfy gauge-invariance, the gauge principle cannot say anything about the superiority and inferiority of these decompositions. What is a crucial difference between these two OAMs from the physical point of view, then ? In our opinion, a superiority of the mechanical OAM over the canonical one lies in the fact that the former not the latter appears in the equation of motion with the Lorentz force. In fact, we have clarified the fact that the QCD equation of motion plays an important role in establishing the connection between the mechanical quark OAM and the observable GPD G_2, which appears in the collinear (GPD) factorization scheme.

We have also verified non-universal nature of the statement that the momentum variable in the Wigner distribution refers to the canonical momentum not the mechanical momentum. Instead, we gave a universally correct physical interpretation of the Wigner-distribution-motivated definitions of the average transverse momentum as well as the average longitudinal OAM. It is true that the average longitudinal OAM of quarks defined by the Wigner distribution coincides with the canonical OAM not the mechanical OAM. The physical reason of it can be easily understood once one accepts our interpretation that the average OAM defined by the Wigner distribution represents the OAM of a quark in the asymptotic region after leaving the spectator in the semi-inclusive DIS reaction. Note that it is the OAM of a free quark if it were not for the color confinement. Unfortunately, this asymptotic OAM of a quark is not a direct observable because of the color confinement of QCD. The fact is that, any practical extraction through DIS measurements must be based on the known TMD or collinear factorization scheme, and that we do not know yet any TMD or GPD related to the canonical OAM.

The author greatly acknowledges enlightening discussion with E. Leader, M. Anselmino, and C. Lorcé during the ECT* workshop on "Spin and Orbital Angular Momentum of Quarks and Gluons in the Nucleon". He also appreciate many helpful discussions with K. Tanaka. Several useful comments by S. C. Tiwari are also greatly acknowledged.

References

1. J. Aschman *et al.* (EMC Collaboration) Phys. Lett. B **206**, 364 (1988).
2. J. Aschman *et al.* (EMC Collaboration) Nucl. Phys. B **328**, 1 (1989).
3. R. L. Jaffe and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B **337**, 509 (1990).
4. E. Leader and C. Lorcé, Phys. Rep. **541**, 163 (2014).
5. M. Wakamatsu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29**, 1430012 (2014).
6. X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997).
7. X. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 056003 (1998).
8. A. I. Akhiezer and V. B. Berestetskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (John Willey & Sons Inc., 1965)
9. J. M. Jauch and F. Rohrlich, *The Theory of Photons and Electrons* (Springer-Verlar, Berlin, 1976)
10. V. B. Berestetskii, E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1982)
11. C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc and G. Grynberg, *Photons and Atoms* (John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1989)
12. R. A. Beth, *Phys. Rev.* **50**, 115 (1936).
13. L. Allen, M. W. Beijersbergen, R. J. C. Spreeuw and J. P. Woerdman, *Phys. Rev.* A **45**, 8185 (1992).
14. X.-S. Chen, X.-F. Lü, W.-M. Sun, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 232002 (2008).
15. X.-S. Chen, W.-M. Sun, X.-F. Lü, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 062001 (2009)
16. M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114010 (2010).
17. M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 014012 (2011)
18. M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 114039 (2012).
19. S. V. Bashinsky and R. L. Jaffe, Nucl. Phys. B **536**, 303 (1999).
20. X. Ji, X. Xiong and F. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 152005 (2012).
21. X. Ji, Y. Xu and Y. Zhao, *JHEP* **1208**, 082 (2012).
22. C. Lorcé, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 034031(2013).
23. C. Lorcé, Phys. Lett. B **719**, 185 (2013).
24. C. Lorcé, Nucl. Phys. A **925**, 1 (2014).
25. M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 094035 (2013).
26. N. Stoilov, Bulg. J. Phys. —bf 41, 251 (2014).
27. J. Francçis, S. Lazzarini and T. Masson, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 045014 (2015).
28. X. Ji, J. H. Zhang and Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 112002 (2013).
29. J.C. Collins, *Foundations of Perturbative QCD* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).
30. Y. Hatta, X. Ji and Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 085030 (2014).
31. A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 289 (1991).
32. J. Kodaira and K. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 191 (1999).
33. Y. Hatta, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 041701 (2011).
34. S. J. Van Enk and G. Nienhuis, *J. Mod. Opt.* **41**, 963 (1994).
35. S. J. Van Enk and G. Nienhuis, *Europhys. Lett.* **25**, 497 (1994).
36. S. M. Barnett and L. Allen, 1994 Opt. Commun. **110**, 670 (1994).
37. K. Y. Bliokh, M. A. Alonso, E. A. Ostrovskaya and A. Aiello, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 063825 (2010).
38. E. Leader, 2013 Phys. Lett. B **720**, 120 (2013).
39. Y. Hatta, K. Tanaka and S. Yoshida, JHEP **1210**, 080 (2012).
40. A. Harindranath, R. Kundu and A. Mukherjee, Phys. Lett. B **728**, 63 (2014).
41. R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Lett. B **365**, 359 (1996).
42. M. A. Berger, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **41**, B167 (1999).
43. M. Burkardt, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 14014 (2013).
44. Y. Hatta, Phys. Lett. B **708**, 186 (2012).
45. J. C. Collins, Phys. Lett. B **536**, 43 (2002).
46. A. V. Belitsky, X. Ji and F. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B **656**, 165 (2003).
47. D. Boer, P. J. Mulders and F. Pijlman, Nucl. Phys. B **667**, 201 (2003).
48. A. V. Efremov and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Lett. B **150**, 383 (1985).
49. J. Qiu and G. Sterman, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 014004 (1991).
50. J. Qiu and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **378**, 52 (1992).
51. S. Meissner, A. Metz and M. Schlegel, JHEP **0908**, 056 (2009).
52. D. Sivers, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 83 (1990).
53. D. Sivers, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 261 (1991).
54. Ph. Haegler, A. Mukherjee and A. Schaefer, Phys. Lett. B **582**, 55 (2004).
55. Y. Hatta and S. Yoshida, JHEP **1210**, 080 (2012).
56. C. Lorcé and B. Pasquini, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014015 (2011).
57. M. Penttinen, M. V. Polyakov, A. G. Shuvaev and M. Strikman, 2000 Phys. Lett. B **491**, 96 (2000).
58. D. V. Kiptily and M.V. Polyakov, Eur. Phys. J. C **37**, 105 (2004).
59. A. Courtoy, G. R. Goldstein, J. O. G. Hernandez, S. Liuti and A. Rajan
Phys. Lett. B **731**, 141 (2014)
60. A. Courtoy, G. R. Goldstein, J. O. G. Hernandez, S. Liuti and A. Rajan
arXiv : 1412.0647 [hep-ph]
61. R. D. Amado, Phys. Rev. C **19**, 1473 (1979).
62. J. L. Friar, Phys. Rev. C **20**, 325 (1979).
63. S. K. Bogner, R. J. Furnstahl, S. Ramanan and A. Schwenk, Nucl Phys. A **784**, 79 (2007).
64. P. G. Ratcliffe, Nucl Phys. B **264**, 493 (1986).
65. I. I. Balitsky and V. M. Braun, Nucl Phys. B **361**, 93 (1991).
66. H. Eguchi, Y. Koike and K. Tanaka, Nucl. Phys. B **752**, 1 (2006).
67. P. Lowdon, Nucl. Phys. B **889**, 801 (2014).
68. T. Liu and B.-Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 017501 (2015).
69. C. Lorceé, arXiv : 1502.06656 [hep-ph]